

REMARKS

New claims 28-30 are added and claims 25-27 are cancelled, hence, claims 1-24 and 28-30 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1, 9, and 17 are amended.

The amendments to the claims 1, 9, and 17 and the new claims are supported at least on pages 8-10 of the specification.

I. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action dated January 12, 2007, claims 1, 2, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills in view of Koyota. Applicant amends claim 1 and traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites a feature of determining an offset between the starting mark of one of the selected portions of the first content and a second starting mark of the corresponding portion of the second content. Claim 1 further recites synchronizing the first content and second content based on said offset.

In the final Office Action it is asserted that view window 20, shown in Fig. 2 of Mills, corresponds to the claimed first content stored in a first format, and that the video clip in the clip edit window 38 corresponds to the claimed second content stored in a second format.

However, Mills in view of Koyota neither teaches nor suggests determining an offset between the starting marks of a selected portion of first content and a second starting mark of the corresponding portion of second content. Mills in view of Koyota also does not teach or suggest synchronizing the first content and second content based on the above offset. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Mills in view of Koyota does not render claim 1 unpatentable.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114

Application No.: 09/829,676

Attorney Docket No.: A8693

Claims 2 and 8 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Claims 3-7, 11-15, and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills in view of Koyata and further in view of Fujita (US Pat. No. 6,321,024, hereinafter "Fujita").

Claims 3-7, 11-15, and 19-23 are patentable at least because of their dependency from claim 1 and because Fujita does not remedy the deficiencies of Mills and Koyata with respect to claim 1.

Claims 9, 10, 16-18 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills in view of Koyata and further in view of alleged Official Notice that it is well known in the art to embody inventions in software to be executed by computer.

Claims 9 and 17 recite a feature of determining an offset between the starting mark of one of the selected portions of the first content and a second starting mark of the corresponding portion of the second content. Claims 9 and 17 further recite synchronizing the first content and second content based on said offset.

Claims 9 and 17 are therefore patentable at least for reasons stated for claim 1 and because the alleged Official Notice does not remedy the deficiencies of Mills and Koyata.

The remaining dependent claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114


Application No.: 09/829,676

Attorney Docket No.: A8693

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



J. Warren Lytle, Jr.

Registration No. 39,283

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 16, 2007